



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,905	03/15/2001	Norman H. Stepno	BEU/STEPNO	2923
7590	02/08/2005		EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 4th Floor 625 Slaters Lane Alexandria, VA 22314-1176			COSIMANO, EDWARD R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/805,905	STEPNO	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Edward R. Cosimano	3629		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other:

1. Applicant should note the changes to patent practice and procedure:
 - A) effective December 01, 1997 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 62, No. 197, Friday October 10, 1997;
 - B) effective November 07, 2000 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 65, No. 54603, September 08, 2000; and
 - C) Amendment in revised format, Vol. 1267 of the Official Gazette published February 25, 2003.
2. The specification and drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification or drawings. Applicant should note the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.52, 37 CFR § 1.74, § 1.75, § 1.84(o,p(5)), § 1.121(a)-1.121(f) & § 1.121(h)-1.121(i).
3. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

3.1 Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

3.1.1 The instant claims recite a system, (claims 1-7), and a method comprising a series of steps to be performed, (claims 8-14), and a manufacture comprising program code, (claims 15-19), which have a disclosed practical application in the technological or useful arts. Further, the instant claims do not merely define either a computer program, a data structure, non-functional descriptive material, (i.e. mere data) or a natural phenomenon.

3.1.2 In regard to claims 1-19, the invention as set forth in these claims merely describes:

A) collecting data/information and merging the data into a single file/database. However, the process/system/manufacture as recited in these claims does not require the result of either the claim as a whole or the manipulations of data as recited in these claims be applied in any manner so as to be tangibly used in a concrete manner and hence to produce a useful

concrete and tangible result, that is a concrete and tangible application with in the technological or useful arts.

3.1.3 It is further noted that applicant has not recited in these claims a specific process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, which is either:

- A) altered or changed or modified by the invention recited in claims; or
- B) utilizes the result of the invention recited in these claims; or
- C) is operated or controlled by the result of the invention recited in these claims.

3.1.4 It is further noted in regard to claims 1-19, that as claimed applicant has not claimed:

A) pre computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data, which originates from an unknown source, is manipulated or transformed/changed before it is processed by the claimed invention; or

B) post computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data which represents the result of the claimed manipulation, is neither manipulated nor used nor changed by any device after it has been processed by the claimed invention; or

C) a practical use of the claimed invention by any physical system or device or method outside of the claimed invention other than a statement of the intended use of the claimed invention; or

D) process steps or physical acts/operations by the claimed invention that would affect the internal operation of a computer/machine as were found to be statutory in either In re McIlroy 170 USPQ 31 (CCPA, 1971) or In re Waldbaum 173 USPQ 430 (CCPA, 1972); or

E) process steps or physical acts/operations by the claimed invention that would be considered as going beyond the manipulation of “abstract ideas” as were found to be non-statutory in In re Warmerdam 31 USPQ2d 1754 (CAFC, 1994); or

F) a concrete and tangible practical application of either:

- (1) the invention as a whole; or
- (2) the final results of the manipulations/actions with in the technological or useful arts;

note In re Sarkar 200 USPQ 132 (CCPA, 1978) where the process step of “constructing said obstruction within the actual open channel at the specified adjusted location indicated by the mathematical model” was held to be so tenuous connected to the remaining process steps as to not be a process within the scope of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Hence, the invention of claims 1-19 is merely directed to an hypothetical mental exercise that manipulates an abstract idea of merging collected data/information into a single file that as claimed is not used and hence is without a claimed concrete and tangible practical application of the abstract idea, (note In re Beauregard 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995) and the associated claims of U.S. Patent 5,710,578; and State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. 47 USPQ2d 1596 (CAFC 1998)).

3.1.5 It is further noted that the type/nature of either the data or the calculated numbers does not affect the operation of the claimed invention and hence are considered to be non function descriptive material, (note In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

3.1.6 In practical terms, claims define nonstatutory processes if they:

- A) consist solely of mathematical operations without some claimed practical application (i.e., executing a “mathematical algorithm”); or
- B) simply manipulate abstract ideas, e.g., a bid (Schrader, 22 F.3d at 293-94, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59) or a bubble hierarchy (Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759),

without some claimed practical application of the mathematics or abstract idea.

3.1.7 In view of the above analysis claims 1-19, as a whole, are directed to an hypothetical mental exercise that merely manipulates mathematics or an abstract idea without a claimed concrete and tangible practical application of the mathematics or abstract idea, and hence are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

3.2 Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

3.2.1 The instant claims recite a system/device/manufacture, (claims 15-19), which has a disclosed practical application in the technological or useful arts, and which does not merely

define either a computer program, a data structure, non-functional descriptive material, (i.e. mere data) or a natural phenomenon. Hence, the instant claims merely define device/manufacture that contains a data structure comprising series of steps or acts or functions or operations that as claimed could be but are not necessarily to be performed by a computer.

3.2.2 It is further noted that applicant has not recited a specific machine since the steps or acts or functions or operations recited in the claim are merely to illustrate the steps or acts or functions or operations of the instant invention since these steps or acts or functions or operations as claimed are not in fact implemented by a processor/computer. Hence, applicant envisions the invention as recited in claims 15-19 as a disembodied programs or storage device, i.e. memory, that stores a computer program as a non-functional data structure. Such a disembodied storage device is not a specific machine because:

- A) it is not associated with a computer in such a way as to cause the computer to operate in a specific manner, (note In re Beauregard 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995) and the associated claims of U.S. Patent 5,710,578); and
- B) a memory device alone can not perform the functions recited within the claims.

Therefore, the recited disembodied storage device, which itself can not perform the functions recited within the claims as the invention, is inoperative and lacks utility for the purpose of the invention.

3.2.3 In view of the above, the invention recited in claims 15-19, merely describes an abstract idea of a disembodied storage device, i.e. memory, that stores a computer program as a non-functional data structure, since a disembodied storage device by itself can not produce a concrete and tangible result by performing the functions recited within the claims as the invention (State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. 47 USPQ2d 1596 (CAFC 1998)). Hence, claims 15-19 do not have a claimed practical application, since the disembodied storage device is inoperative and therefore lacks utility for the purpose of the invention.

3.2.4 Nonfunctional descriptive material cannot render nonobvious an invention that would have otherwise been obvious. Cf. In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404

(Fed. Cir. 1983) (when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability). Common situations involving nonfunctional descriptive material are:

- a computer-readable storage medium that differs from the prior art solely with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material, such as music or a literary work, encoded on the medium;
- a computer that differs from the prior art solely with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the machine functions (i.e., the descriptive material does not reconfigure the computer), or
- a process that differs from the prior art only with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the process steps are to be performed to achieve the utility of the invention.

3.2.5 Hence, claims 15-19 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

3.3 Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter, since:

A) in regard to claims 1-19, these claims fail to comply with the “requirements this title, namely 35 U.S.C. § 102 as set forth below.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.1 Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by either Sansone et al (5,051,914) or Humes et al (5,377,120) or Delfer, III (5,774,885).

4.1. In regard to claims 18, 15, either Sansone et al ('914) or Humes et al ('120) or Delfer, III ('885) disclose a computer implemented mail processing system/method, that under the control of an operating program collect mailing data from a number of different sources. Next the collected mailing data from each source for a particular delivery address is merged/co-

mingled into a single mailing to that address so that all of the mailer would save on the postage expenses. Finally the combined mailing is produce, franked and placed in the delivery system.

5. The examiner has cited prior art of interest, for example:

- A) Baggally et al (EP 0153813) discloses that the contents of an item of mail may be sorted based on weight so that none of the postage value that is applied to the item will be wasted.
- B) Hollingswoth (4,589,555) which disclose that mailing may be sorted to achieve the maximum postage discount that is applicable to the mailing.
- C) the IBM TDB which discloses that mailing may be sorted and printed in real time.
- D) Dreyer et al (6,246,993) discloses that the production schedules may be altered so that the finished product to be mailed will achieve the maximum postage discount that is applicable to the mailing.

6. The shorten statutory period of response is set to expire 3 (three) months from the mailing date of this Office action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (703) 305-9783. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (703)-308-2702. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

- 7.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL/DRAFT FAXES is (703) 746-7240.
- 7.2 The fax phone number for OFFICIAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.
- 7.3 The fax phone number for AFTER FINAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

02/06/05


Edward R. Cosimano
Primary Examiner A.U. 3629